

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Sisselman in view of Kawamura. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Claim 1 calls for an image sensor to capture frames, a storage to store a first sequence of frames of predetermined duration as a first loop and a second sequence of frames of predetermined duration as a second loop, the storage coupled to the sensor, a display coupled to the storage to display the sequence of frames, and a controller to automatically store successive sequences of frames of predetermined duration as a first loop or a second loop, and the controller to selectively play back either the first loop or the second loop in response to a user input. At a minimum, Sisselman fails to disclose selective play back of either a first loop or a second loop.

It is argued in the Office Action that Sisselman discloses a microprocessor that stores successive sequences of frames of predetermined duration including earlier and later sequences, the earlier and later sequences can be seen as a first loop and a second loop. It is also argued in the Office Action that Sisselman's microprocessor stores the later sequence of frames in the storage and automatically overwrites the earlier sequence. It is respectfully submitted that where a later sequence is stored and overwrites the earlier sequence, the ability to select either the earlier sequence or the later sequence for play back does not exist.

According to some embodiments of the present invention, an integral number of loops may be employed depending on the available memory and the predetermined loop length. During use, a user may wish to save the loop that is currently being stored. If so, the next available loop becomes the current loop, which may be then be saved at the user's request. This may continue until all of the loops that are not the default loop are used. Thus, any one of the loops may be selected for play back. Because neither Sisselman nor Kawamura disclose a controller to selectively play back either a first loop or a second loop in response to a user input, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

Furthermore, Sisselman fails to disclose two loops of predetermined duration. For example, pursuant to Sisselman a memory loop has a number of sequential memory blocks. [0032]; [0037]. As shown in Figure 6, the exemplary memory loop has eight three-second memory segments. When a user hits a replay button, the memory loop may be broken. The loop may be reformed with the memory segments that have not been isolated for replay. Because the reformed loop is the result of an impulsive action, its length is not known beforehand—before


the user's action. In other words, the number of blocks in a reformed loop is dependant upon what memory segment is currently being written to when the user takes action and the number of segments that the user desires to have replayed. Thus, any reformed loop that does not include isolated segments is of unknown length before the user took the action. As such, Sisselman fails to disclose a second loop of duration determined before the user hits the replay button. For this additional reason, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1 and claims dependent thereon.

The rejections of claims 14-23 are similar to the rejections espoused for claims 1-13. Thus, for at least the reasons expressed above, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established for any of the claims in the above-referenced application.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2004



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906